

THE IMPEACHMENT.

On Saturday, 11th inst., Gen. SHERMAN was introduced as a witness for the defense. His testimony was objected to and the Senate decided not to receive it. This decision was inconsistent with those previously given by the Court, and if persisted in would have overthrown the greater part of the evidence the counsel of the President had labored so long to collect in his defense. On Monday, 13th inst., Gen. SHERMAN was re-called.

The President's counsel made some further attempts to get in the evidence of General SHERMAN, in relation to avowals of intention made to him by the President, but the Senate adhered to its ruling made on Saturday, and at that point, and the effort was relinquished. Some evidence of no great importance was next put in, and then it occurred to Senator JOHNSON, of Maryland, to recall General SHERMAN and ask him the question what purpose the President avowed in offering to appoint him Secretary of War. This was the very point the defense had been unsuccessfully trying to get at; and its admission was energetically opposed by the managers; but, on the 15th inst., being taken, the Senate decided, by a majority of one, to receive the evidence. General SHERMAN then proceeded to give the substance of his conversations with the President, in which the latter declared that he believed the interest of the army and of the country required the removal of Stanton. He desired to have the constitutional duty of the President to remove Stanton expressed in no other way, and he believed Stanton would make no resistance, because he "knew him to be a coward." Mr. BUTLER sharply contested the admission of this testimony, at every step; held a brief conversation with the General during the recess; and, finally, notified him that the managers would require his attendance, probably for cross-examination, to-day. An attempt was made to draw out an admission that Gen. SHERMAN advised the President to remove Stanton, but this question was ruled out. The progress of the case was watched with eager interest throughout the day, and at times a good deal of excitement was apparent on the floor as well as in the galleries.

On Tuesday, Mr. STANLEY was taken ill, and the Court adjourned until Wednesday.

On that day Mr. STANLEY was not present, and his associates were not sufficiently familiar with the character of the evidence still in reserve to warrant them in proceeding with oral testimony. Mr. CURTIS announced, soon after the opening of the court, that he would consume the day in the presentation of documentary testimony.

Previous to this, however, some time had been consumed in a discussion of the attempt made on Monday to give the managers and counsel opportunities for more speeches than are provided for in the rules already adopted. It came up as a motion of Mr. SUMNER to allow such of the managers and counsel as are crowded out of the proceedings of the court, as part of the proceedings of the court. For this Mr. CURTIS moved a substitute, allowing each side four days for oral testimony, after the close of the testimony.

Finally, Mr. DRAKE moved to postpone the whole subject indefinitely, which was done by 37 to 15.

The first document presented in evidence was the appointment of THOMAS ERWIN, of Ohio, as Secretary of War, made by the President on the 22d of February. The nomination was made out that day, as testified by the President's private secretary, but when the secretary reached the Capitol the Senate had adjourned. It did not, therefore, reach the Senate until Monday, 24th of February.

The next document offered was the message of the President in answer to the executive resolution of the 21st, which pronounced the removal of STANTON illegal and unconstitutional. This message was dated February 24th. BUTLER promptly objected to its introduction, on the ground that it was a declaration made after the crime had been committed. He concluded by asking if the counsel for the President dared to offer such a thing in evidence.

This brought Mr. EVANS to his feet in a very timely little speech, which he composed by saying that he and his associates were not in the habit of considering dates in their forensic discussions. On the rules of practice, or of law and evidence, the counsel might claim some superiority over the managers; but in the measure of daring they certainly could not compete with them. This rebuke attracted the notice of the court, and created a little merriment at BUTLER's expense. It was followed by a considerable wrangling upon the subject.

The Chief Justice expressed the opinion that the message was not competent evidence. He would, however, submit the question to the Senate if any Senator desired it. No Senator desired it, and the document was ruled out. Next, the counsel presented a long list of appointments made in preceding administrations without the advice and consent of the Senate while the Senate was in session. These were not put in as testimony, but were ordered to be printed and laid upon the desks of the Senators.

The rest of the day was occupied in the introduction of documents of various kinds, none of them new to the public or important in their character.

At half-past 3, the counsel having finished the business they had appointed for the day, the court adjourned.

Immediately upon the opening of the court of impeachment on Thursday, Mr. SUMNER arose and offered a declaration of opinion to the effect that as the trial was an important one, and as the Senators were judges of law as well as of evidence, all testimony offered which was not trivial or irrelevant should be received.

This, coming from such a source, astonished all who heard it, but it was quickly disposed of on a motion of Mr. CURTIS to lay it on the table, which was carried by a vote of 23 to 11. The defense then proceeded with the evidence. Messrs. COX and MERRICK, two Washington lawyers, were put on the stand. The testimony was objected to at successive stages on the ground that it related to declarations made by the President after the fact. The managers, however, were overruled by the Senate, and the evidence was admitted. It was to the effect that the first gentleman was employed by the President on February 22, the day after Mr. THOMAS's appointment, to assist the Attorney General in preparing a case for the court, to do the legal test of the constitutionality of the civil tenure of office law.

Mr. MERRICK testified that he was employed as Mr. THOMAS's counsel, but subsequently acted conjointly with Mr. COX in making up a case for the court, under the direction of

the President and Attorney General. The witness detailed the proceedings in court on the occasion of the arrest of General THOMAS, and stated that owing to the discharge of that gentleman by the Judge it was found impossible to get up a habeas corpus case for the Supreme Court, and that the application for a writ of habeas corpus was not made as intended, owing to the discovery that it would take a year to get it before the Supreme Court for final decision.

E. O. PENNIE, who was Secretary of the Philadelphia Convention of August, 1865, was then put on the stand, and the defense stated that they expected to prove by him that on the day of THOMAS's appointment the President told him that THOMAS was in quiet possession of the War Office; that his appointment was merely temporary, and it was the President's intention to send in the name of some one at once to the Senate for confirmation. This was objected to and ruled out by the Senate.

At this point the principal scene of the day occurred, when, at quarter past 4 o'clock, Mr. EVANS rose and said the President's counsel were not prepared to proceed further with the introduction of testimony to-day. The inference from his remark was that the court had better adjourn for the day.

Mr. BUTLER jumped to his feet very quickly and delivered a speech of twenty minutes' duration, the like of which has never before been heard on an impeachment trial or any other trial. He started out by asserting that this was an effort to carry into effect the declarations made by the Democrats in the House, that the trial would be prolonged until the end of President JOHNSON's term of office. He jumped about the floor and moved every limb and muscle of his body, like frogs in the pangs of vivisection. He charged the President with every murder that had been committed, and was being committed in the South, and said these outrages upon the Union people would be continued until the great criminal was removed from office.

At this point SUMNER put in a loud "That's so!" and the galleries attempted a demonstration of applause, which, however, was quickly stopped.

This encouraged BUTLER went on thundering and roaring forth his denunciations of the President, charging on him the responsibility for treasury frauds, which he said he was prepared with documentary proof to establish. He immediately produced some tabular statements, setting forth some facts connected with the sale of Government gold, which, he said, proved the President to be defrauding the Government.

The Senate had now begun to wonder, rather than to listen. Everybody stared at the impassioned gesticulation, and many thought he must have forgotten where he was and what was the occasion which had called forth such a torrent of abuse where an argument was expected. Still he pranced and danced and thundered and talked of the great criminal, and repeated his accusations about the murder of Union men in the South. Fessenden looked at him with utter disgust. SUMNER smiled approval, and the Democrats smiled amusement and derision. After 20 minutes of this most extraordinary style of oratory, Mr. BUTLER sat down.

Mr. EVANS immediately rose, calm and collected, and was proceeding to a very sharp rebuke of Mr. BUTLER, whose speech he characterized as a harangue, when Mr. CAMERON appealed to the Chair to know if it was in order to apply the word "harangue." There was a scene of confusion just here which threatened to have a serious termination, and there is no telling where it would have ended but for the coolness and discretion of the Chief Justice, who, amid the excitement of the moment, heard a motion to adjourn, coming from Mr. FERRY, of Connecticut. This was evidently a welcome sound to him, and he made the best possible use of it to help himself and the Senate out of the impending trouble. "It is moved and seconded that the Senate adjourn," said he in a voice which told him how anxious he was that the motion should prevail. "All who are in favor of that motion will say 'aye.'" Less than half the members present said "aye." The Chief Justice did not put the negative, but said, "the court stands adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock." So the court stands adjourned, and for the fact that there was not a great many of the Chief Justice was thanked by a great many.

On Friday, 17th inst., Messrs. Welles, Seward, McCulloch, Browning, and Randall were upon the floor of the Senate all day, expecting every moment to be called to the stand. Mr. Seward seemed himself next to Mr. Chandler, with whom he seemed to engage in friendly converse all day. Mr. Randall circulated among the members pretty freely, and seemed to be on good terms with them all.

The first business of the court was the adoption of the resolution offered by Mr. CONNORS on Thursday, that the court meet at 11 o'clock each day. This was carried by 99 to 14.

Mr. FERRY then rose and said that there appeared in the *Globe*, to-day, as a part of Manager BUTLER's speech, certain tabular statements which were not read in the Senate. He moved that said statements be stricken out of the official report of the trial.

Mr. BUTLER was proceeding with an explanation when Senator HENDRICKS, constraining it as an attack upon the Secretary of the Treasury, rose to ask if it was in order for a manager of the impeachment to make such attacks upon the Secretary, when there was no one upon the floor who had a right to defend him. Senator ANTHONY said he would move, if there were no objections, that Mr. HENDRICKS have permission to defend Mr. McCulloch, but an objection came from Mr. EDMUNDS, and there the matter stopped. Mr. FERRY's resolution was adopted.

The first witness called was W. W. ARMSTRONG of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. The defense attempted to prove by him that the crowd at Cleveland constantly interrupted the President in his speech, and that the crowd was disorderly, &c.

The next witness, Barton Able of St. Louis, testified in relation to the St. Louis speech; that the President at first declined to make a speech, but finally yielded to a pressing invitation, and appeared upon the balcony of the Southern Hotel. He was frequently interrupted by the crowd, among whom were many of his political enemies.

George Knapp, proprietor of the St. Louis Republic, testified substantially the same as the previous witness, as to the intentions of the President, his refusal at first to make a speech and his final acquiescence at the urgent request of friends to appear. Mr. Knapp was sharply cross-examined by Mr. BUTLER, who thrust in irrelevant questions as to the politics of the Republican, &c., but he answered every question promptly, and proved better than any other witness that the President was bullied into whatever discourses he committed.

Mr. ZEDER, a reporter for the Republican, was then examined as to the accuracy of the several reports of the St. Louis speech. This closed the case as to the President's speeches. The President's counsel then in-

troduced another installment of documentary evidence in regard to the form of appointments, and also called Frederick W. Seward to the stand to prove the practice of the State Department in the appointment of consuls and diplomatic officers. This evidence did not seem to be regarded as very important by the court or managers, though the managers reserved the right to object to certain portions of it, if it should prove, on investigation, to be irrelevant.

At a little before 2 o'clock Mr. CURTIS created quite a buzz of excitement in the galleries and on the floor by asking the Sergeant-at-Arms to call Secretary Welles. The venerable Secretary came forward behind a pair of gold spectacles, and stood up, straight as a ramrod, at the witness stand. He was interrogated as to the date of his commission as Secretary of the Navy, and said it was March, 1861. He had been in the Cabinet ever since, but had not been reappointed or recommended. He then went on to detail the occurrences which induced the President to send for Gen. Emory on the 22d. He had been informed by his son that certain military movements were going on in this city, which he thought it proper that the President should be informed. He called at the White House next day and advised the President of what he had heard, and also advised him to send for Gen. Emory, which he did. This testimony explains all that appears to be mysterious in the testimony elicited by the prosecution from General Emory in the early days of the trial.

Judge CURTIS then questioned Mr. Welles as to what took place in the Cabinet in regard to the removal of Mr. Stanton, but Mr. Butler pricked up his ears and was prompt with an objection.

The Chief Justice said he was clearly of the opinion that the testimony was admissible; whereupon Mr. DRAKE roared out an appeal and a call for the year and years.

A great deal of interest was taken in the result of the vote. As the roll call progressed it was seen that it would be closely contested, and each side mustered what strength it could from the lobbies and cloak-rooms. The opponents of impeachment felt greatly relieved when, by 26 to 23, the court decided to let Mr. Welles proceed.

The Secretary stated that the Cabinet was unanimous for the removal of Mr. Stanton and the appointment of General Thomas. This was regarded as a great point for the defense, and it encouraged Judge CURTIS in the effort to get more from the same source. He then went back to the time of the passage of the tenure-of-office law, with the intent of proving that Stanton and every other member of the Cabinet believed that law to be unconstitutional; but Butler entered a very decided objection to this question. Then followed a debate, of more than half an hour's duration, between Evans and Butler. When it was thought a vote was about to be taken, Mr. CONNORS moved an adjournment, for which most of the impeachers seemed anxious. This is the first time the impeachers have voted for an adjournment as early as half-past 4 o'clock. Mr. CONNORS said he made the motion by request, as it was the desire of the managers to argue the question at length; but the fact that the impeachers were afraid Welles would be allowed to answer CURTIS's question, and they thought it best to adjourn and spend the night in stiffening weak backs, of which the day's proceedings gave evidence of several.

With Mr. STANTON's consent we place the subjoined correspondence before our readers. We may have occasion hereafter to allude to it, but for the present we let it speak for itself.

MAYSVILLE, KY., APRIL 10, 1868.
Hon. R. H. Stanton—My Dear Sir:—It is no secret in this community that many of the articles published in the *Maysville Bulletin* owe their paternity to yourself, and that other articles have been written by your son, Mr. H. T. Stanton. The paper has been recognized as your personal organ, and as especially devoted to your interests. It is known that the gentlemen who are the nominal editors of the paper neither write for it nor control its utterances. These facts, I think, warrant me in calling your attention to the enclosed article from the *Bulletin* of the 9th inst., and in requesting you to inform me if it meets your approbation or has your endorsement. But one construction can be placed on that article, and that is that it avows the determination of the Democratic party, as organized and controlled in Kentucky, to ostracize all Union men who continued so during and throughout the war. In other words, that however steadfast a man may have been in opposition to the unconstitutional measures of Mr. Lincoln's administration, and to the illegitimate direction given to the war, and however earnestly he may now labor for the restoration of the Southern States to a position of perfect equality in the Union, yet, unless he repudiates his convictions as a Union man, it is an act of impudence in him to ask office at the hands of the Democratic party; and that however worthy he may be in all other respects, the mere fact that he still thinks and proclaims when called on to do so that the rebellion was unlawful and unjustifiable, and that it was the duty of the Government to suppress it, is sufficient of itself to insure his exclusion from office and ostracism by the Democratic party. I wish to know if you endorse this article and justify the ostracism of Conservative Union men on the ground set forth by the *Bulletin*. I have avowed my purpose to support you for the Judgeship of this Judicial Circuit, and I hope I may be able to do so cheerfully and cordially. But as this question has been made an issue by the paper for which you frequently write, I feel that I am justified in asking at your hands a distinct and unequivocal repudiation of the sentiments of the enclosed article, or else an equally distinct and unequivocal endorsement of these sentiments. Awaiting your answer, I remain, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
THOMAS M. GREEN.

MR. STANTON'S RESPONSE.
MAYSVILLE, KY., APRIL 13, 1868.
Thomas M. Green, Esq.—My Dear Sir:—Neither my son nor myself is the author of many of the best editorials which appear in the columns of the *Bulletin*, and I do not recognize your right to hold me responsible for its utterances; nor do I think you do the editors of that paper justice, when you intimate that it is my personal organ, and that they do not control its contents. The paper is no more devoted to my interests than it is to the interest of any other individual Democrat. This much in reply to the opening sentences of your letter.

The object of your letter is to know if the article in the *Bulletin* of the 9th inst. meets my approbation and has my endorsement. I answer the inquiry in the same spirit of kindness in which it is made, and frankly say that the article does have my approval and endorsement. You must allow me, however, to say that it does not warrant either the construction you

have put upon it in your letter, or the application you have made of it to the Hon. R. H. Stanton in your paper of Saturday last. The article does not "avow the determination of the Democratic party, as organized and controlled in Kentucky, to ostracize all Union men who continued so during and throughout the war," nor does it require that "he shall repudiate his convictions as a Union man" to render himself eligible to the favor of the party. Such a construction cannot be fairly placed upon it. Indeed, the article explicitly declares that "the Democratic party has not, and never will, make it a rule to ostracize any man simply because he is in favor of the war, or because he is what is called a Union man." When the party adopts that rule, I shall be as ready as yourself to condemn it. The article is manifestly aimed at that class of men who pride themselves upon their union hostility to the Democratic party, make a vaunting parade of their Unionism, acknowledge no past errors, and still think all who opposed the war are traitors and rebels." It seems to me such men must have an unusual degree of assurance if they expect the Democratic party to elevate them to office in preference to their own tried friends. They give us no credit for the sincerity of our principles or the integrity of our purpose. They still stigmatize us as "rebels," or "rebel sympathizers," and thus stimulate and encourage Radical hostility to our organization in Kentucky at the very time they themselves profess to be warring against Radicalism. Such men, in our ranks, would only be agents of discord and ministers of evil. I am sure, as a man of honor, you could not expect me to fraternize politically, with any degree of cordiality, with men who not only professed to believe, but persistently called, me a rebel and a traitor, and whose course I believed was calculated to feed the flame of Radical animosity against me and my party, much less to give them my support for office in preference to my old political associates.

I have given too many votes for Union men since the commencement of the war to be justly subject to the imputation of desiring to ostracize men simply because of their Unionism. The Union man who comes into our party in good faith, giving us credit for the sincerity of our sentiments, leaving behind him his prejudices, and honestly intending to support our principles, as officially declared by our conventions, will be heartily welcomed by me. I can forget much, and forgive much; and the man, who, from a sense of patriotic duty and an honest heart, no matter what may have been his past political record, joins with the Democracy in its holy struggle in defense of civil liberty, the Constitution and free government, will be met by me with an open hand and a warm heart. He need fear no ostracism at my hands.

I remain, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
R. H. STANTON.

The following is the article to which reference is made in the above correspondence, and by reference to which the reader will be enabled to form an opinion as to its purpose and meaning, and of the animus of the writer and endorser:
Who is RESPONSIBLE FOR HELPINO ABOLITIONISM IN MISSOURI?—Many good and patriotic men, at the breaking out of the war, led to take part with the abolitionists against their brethren of the South under a belief that the war was in good faith for a restoration of the Union. They were not wise enough to see, that it was a war of fanaticism and malice; a war to destroy slavery and the system of slave labor in the South, to erect a New England despotism over the country, and to punish the slaveholding people for daring to show a brave and manly regard for their own rights. In Kentucky, thousands of these men, so soon as they became convinced of the progress of events that the restoration of the Union and the re-establishment of the constitutional relations of the States was not the purpose for which abolitionism was carrying slaughter, and death, and destruction, among the people of the Southern States, ceased to support the war, proclaimed their opposition, united with the party opposed to it, and have acted with the Democracy ever since. Many of them had been in the army, were covered with wounds, but were unwilling to fight longer in a cause they believed to be unparalleled in its atrocity and wickedness.

These men had seen the negro forcibly, and against every principle of constitutional right, taken from their masters without regard to whether their masters were for or against war—had seen these negroes organized, armed and set loose, with brutal ferocity upon the people of the South—had seen the fiendish malice with which abolitionism was pushing on the war to the destruction of the lives, liberty and property of the men, women and children of the slave States—and at the risk of being proscribed, and hunted down as rebels and traitors, abandoned the cause, acknowledged the error of their own conduct and arrayed themselves cordially with that party which had opposed the war from the beginning, and which, in their judgment, promised to be most efficient in bringing about a restoration.

There were others, however, who starting with abolitionism in the war for the destruction of the South, did not quit their relations with the war party even when it became apparent that the war was no longer a war for restoration. They saw the negroes liberated—they saw them armed and put into the field—they saw the process of subjugation working out its natural results—and though they may have ventured now and then a feeble remonstrance against these things, still glorified the war and continued to denounce all as rebels, secessionists and traitors, who did not join with them in doing so. They were for "fighting the rebels with bullets," and after they had crushed the rebels they would fight the abolitionists with bullets. They fought the rebels with bullets until they fought hundreds of thousands of the bravest and best men this country ever produced into bloody graves; until they fought the government into a debt that will oppress and burden the labor of the country for generations to come; until they have enthroned in the political power of the country the basest and most wicked party that ever had power in any age or nation; until they have destroyed all other departments of government except Congress, overturned every principle of the Constitution, abolished free government, and established among us the worst despotism on earth. This is what such men have done by fighting the rebels with bullets. They are now fighting the abolitionists with bullets.

And now, these men after having aided abolitionism in bringing these evils upon the people of the country, call it Unionism, and ostentatiously make a parade of it upon all occasions. They claim it as a merit that they did not act with the Democratic party of Kentucky in opposing the designs of abolitionism. They denounced the Democratic party as secessionists and rebels, and think it a great outrage that Democrats should prefer for office one of their own consistent men, who

has no part of the responsibility for any of the wrongs abolitionism has inflicted upon the country, on its shoulders, to one of that class who helped abolitionism to do its mischief. The Democratic party have not and never will make it a rule to ostracize a man simply because he is in favor of the war, or because he is what is called a Union man. The man who saw the error into which abolitionism was leading him, and, like a brave, true man, had the courage to acknowledge it, and unite with the Democracy in good faith, believing in its principles, need fear no ostracism. But the man who, still glorifying himself for his union zeal in aid of the principles and means which brought the country to its present wretched political condition, having nothing to repent, and who still thinks all who opposed the war were rebels and traitors, must have unmeasured assurance if he thinks the Democratic party ought to elevate him to office in preference to their own men.

REMINISCENCE OF A MISSOURIAN.
During the reign of terror in the present Radical State of Missouri, when bushwhackers and State militia contended for the mastery, not only of local control, but vied with each other in deeds of infernal rascality, there lived in the western portion of the State a high priest of the political church militant—named BRATTON. He sang at all the Conventions from Jefferson city to the country towns, airs of every variety; but was famous for his ditty of:

Gov. Gamble don't want to go to Heaven,
For fear he'll meet John Brown.

His impudence knew no extremity. He preached, prayed, sung, lectured, and was generally officious as ever the devil would want any of his lips to be, in matters both temporal and secular—a perfect devil incarnate, for he was always a devil out of danger.

A large number of PRICE's men in Daviess, Livingston, Grundy and adjoining counties, whose six months term of service having expired, were virtually conscripted into militia service, and rendered post duty. Notwithstanding their presence—and the Col. commanding swore they were as good soldiers sober as he ever saw; but when drunk would hurrah for JEFF. DAVIS—nighly convulsed were held, especially by such as stood in fear of being claimed equally as friends by the bushwhackers and sympathizers as by the militia—a fight from town seemed to be the only deliverance from the dilemma if the dreaded PONTIAC and his band should come.

Being duly inspired, and with a high and holy purpose on his lips, and in his heart PARSON BRATTON duly summoned at this juncture his ex-rebel battalion at the Court House, and having duly lectured, preached, prayed, sung, and exhorted—proceeded to give an illustration through the means of a brickbat, walnut and a hammer which he had come prepared with—a practical illustration of the parties. Breaking the hull he held it up as rebel; bitter, nauseous, disagreeable; and fit only for dye stuff, and making a bad dye at that. The crust enveloping the kernel he next held up as an illustration of the Conservative element, tasteless and useless—but stubbornly hard. Now, said the reverend, I will show you my party—the true Union party; and at once, between hammer and brick broke the walnut which internally proved to be rotten and black. He subsided. It was too much for the Daviess county boys. They broke out vociferously, stamped long and loud. The noise alarmed the citizens who as preconcerted instantly "went for" the brush and reported over the adjoining country that the bushwhackers had taken Chillicothe.

We need offer no apology for yielding so much of our space to the opening speech of Judge CURTIS. He is the ablest jurist in the nation, and the effort is worthy of his ability. The vindication of the President is complete. There is nothing needed to be added. Below we give a description of JUDGE CURTIS by "MACK," of the Cincinnati Commercial:

Judge CURTIS and Judge CURTIS' Speech.
[from the Washington Correspondence of the Cincinnati Commercial.]
The opening speech for the defense was a quiet and grave reminder of a sort of legal eloquence that was tried forty years ago. It brought to mind, in its stately periods, dispassionately, rationally, concisely uttered, the days of Marshall, Kent and Story.

Mr. CURTIS is a man without a smile or a frown. Somber is his vesture, purple is his color. He is very like Daniel Webster in stature, face and manner. He seldom walks in anybody's company, but with a slow, deliberate stride, leaning on a cane, he comes alone to the Capitol, ponderously mounts the steps, yipes his forehead in the ante-room, and, entering the Senate, sits in a condition of vigilant retirement, like a turkey gobbling up his rage and working his craw. He exchanges no words with his legal brethren. If he is introduced to anybody in any grave or recess, he shakes hands with that gravity that Webster used to revel in. He weighs about one hundred and ninety pounds, perhaps more. Nature gave him a good, large, Websterian head; and his face is a fine old liver color. He perspires with great freedom, but never through excitement. His paunch is stately; his cloth gaiters, are eminently legal; no gold seal disturbs the demureness of his vest; his blue eyes retreat into his brows, and his head into his standing collar, and he listens like a phosphorescent bull dog in a dark cellar.

Such is Judge CURTIS, with the additions of straight, brown hair and a face smoothly shaven. Rising to speak, to-day, there were twenty books of reference before him. He put his hands on the base table, looked his gloomy grandest, and began with the manner of a funeral oration. His voice is not strong, but naturally trained by the temperament of the man, and pitched upon the same key, it reaches the ear very pleasantly and drives to do no more. As it carried so its calm burden of argument at an equal pace, the minds of all as left the domain of politics and rose with its cadences into the atmosphere of law. Insensibly we all began to feel that General Butler's speech, which we all had supposed a great performance, had been no more than a smart anecdote. This old time man, never in a hurry, never in zeal, addressed himself to the supposition that his auditors were all learned and self-respecting gentlemen. Every time he said "Senator" he made a cold chill go through the Senate; for during the past two weeks one-half the Senators have forgotten their rank. A venture the supposition that this speech got more respect in every Senator's silent mind than any utterance of his own has had for years past. I did not follow it closely enough to tell you the effect of it as an argument. But it did this, which Butler, Stanbery, Wilson and Bingham had failed to do—it reminded the Senate of itself.

and of the occasion. Everything that had been said before grew little and mean after CURTIS had talked an hour. In all that time he never changed his place, never flattered for a word, nor used any undignified expression whatsoever. Judge Chase heard the argument with the greatest care. It was a study to look at the Chief Justice and the solid old leader, taking his time so tremendously.

GREAT DECREASE IN INCOMES.

The New York Evening Post announces the very significant fact, based upon information received from the assistant Assessors, that there is a general, though a very irregular, decrease in the income tax from last year, and the aggregate tax of that city will fall off more than twenty-five per cent. It is this income tax, with its inquisitorial offensiveness toward every class of the community, that, of all others, should be removed, rather than the taxes on manufactures. Expenses, however, must be reduced before the much-needed remission of taxation shall be really justifiable; and we do not see that our Radical legislators at Washington are doing anything material and permanent to lessen the great cost of their sectional and party rule taking off the domestic tax from a highly protected class of manufactures, with no reduction of duties on the corresponding classes of imports, while still maintaining extravagant and useless ranges of expenditure in maintaining military governments and freedmen's bureaus in ten States, is only a delusive pretense of relieving the people, the effects of which they must ultimately feel with two-fold force. Meantime, the decrease in incomes necessarily goes on under the prostrating effects of such a policy, and the people are still to be annoyed by having their lessening incomes pried into.

Holding one's self responsible to a political party must be somewhat irksome now and then to ambitious aspirants for political distinction. Chief Justice Chase must find it so. He has ventured to claim that in presiding over the Court of Impeachment he had some of the ordinary rights of a presiding officer, and in that claim he has thus far been sustained by the Court. But the Chicago Tribune pours out upon him, in its stunted measure, the vials of its wrath. While in Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet, it says, his arrogance was insufferable. The Republicans have shown their wisdom in not nominating him for the Presidency. He is reminded that he makes a fatal mistake, if he supposes he "can thwart the purpose of the nation to impeach Mr. JOHNSON," and is menaced with impeachment himself, if he persists in his claims, which are declared to be "an assumption of power second only to that which has made JOHNSON's impeachment necessary." Party avowed, administered in this style, is certainly not particularly gentle.

MACAULAY, in that celebrated account of the trial by impeachment of Warren Hastings, has these remarks: "Whatever confidence may be placed in the decision of the Peers on an appeal arising out of an ordinary litigation, it is certain that no man has the least confidence in their impartiality, when a great public functionary, charged with a great State crime, is brought to the bar. They are all politicians. There is hardly one among them whose vote on an impeachment may not be confidently predicted before a witness has been examined." Will any future historian apply remarks like these to the American Senate?

MARRIED.

CARR-MYERS—At Lancaster, Ky., March 29th, 1868, by Albert Myers, D. D., Clerk of the Mason County Ky., to Miss Mattie F. Myers, of Lancaster, Ky.

Mr. Carr is well known to many of the citizens of this region as a young man of high promise in the ministry. He, with his highly accomplished bride, leave America on the 18th of April, as Missionaries to the South Sea Islands. He expects to return to America in five years. Mrs. Carr is a young and a beautiful woman, and a safe success in the great cause he pleads, and a safe return to his native land, is the ardent prayer of his friends and those who are interested in the Master's Vineyard.

POLLOCK-KELLEY—In Germantown, Ky., March 31st, 1868, at the residence of the bride's father by the Rev. B. B. Whitman, Mr. Alfred H. Pollock to Miss Laura Kelley.

The opening speech for the defense was a quiet and grave reminder of a sort of legal eloquence that was tried forty years ago. It brought to mind, in its stately periods, dispassionately, rationally, concisely uttered, the days of Marshall, Kent and Story.

Mr. CURTIS is a man without a smile or a frown. Somber is his vesture, purple is his color. He is very like Daniel Webster in stature, face and manner. He seldom walks in anybody's company, but with a slow, deliberate stride, leaning on a cane, he comes alone to the Capitol, ponderously mounts the steps, yipes his forehead in the ante-room, and, entering the Senate, sits in a condition of vigilant retirement, like a turkey gobbling up his rage and working his craw.

He exchanges no words with his legal brethren. If he is introduced to anybody in any grave or recess, he shakes hands with that gravity that Webster used to revel in. He weighs about one hundred and ninety pounds, perhaps more. Nature gave him a good, large, Websterian head; and his face is a fine old liver color. He perspires with great freedom, but never through excitement. His paunch is stately; his cloth gaiters, are eminently legal; no gold seal disturbs the demureness of his vest; his blue eyes retreat into his brows, and his head into his standing collar, and he listens like a phosphorescent bull dog in a dark cellar.

Such is Judge CURTIS, with the additions of straight, brown hair and a face smoothly shaven.

Rising to speak, to-day, there were twenty books of reference before him. He put his hands on the base table, looked his gloomy grandest, and began with the manner of a funeral oration. His voice is not strong, but naturally trained by the temperament of the man, and pitched upon the same key, it reaches the ear very pleasantly and drives to do no more. As it carried so its calm burden of argument at an equal pace, the minds of all as left the domain of politics and rose with its cadences into the atmosphere of law. Insensibly we all began to feel that General Butler's speech, which we all had supposed a great performance, had been no more than a smart anecdote. This old time man, never in a hurry, never in zeal, addressed himself to the supposition that his auditors were all learned and self-respecting gentlemen. Every time he said "Senator" he made a cold chill go through the Senate; for during the past two weeks one-half the Senators have forgotten their rank. A venture the supposition that this speech got more respect in every Senator's silent mind than any utterance of his own has had for years past. I did not follow it closely enough to tell you the effect of it as an argument. But it did this, which Butler, Stanbery, Wilson and Bingham had failed to do—it reminded the Senate of itself.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

We are authorized to announce Judge R. J. PETERS, of Montgomery—the present incumbent—as a candidate for re-election to the Appellate Bench in the First Appellate District, subject to a Democratic convention of the District.

We are authorized to announce THOS. A. REPPAS as a candidate for Clerk of the Circuit Court of Mason County, subject to the decision of the Democratic Convention.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

TO MARRY OR NOT TO MARRY? WHY NOT? Serious reflections for young men, in Essays of the Harvard Association, on the Psychological Basis of marriage and divorce, by Ignorance of Nature's Laws, in the first of a man. Sent in sealed letter envelopes, free of charge. Address: DR. SKILLING HIGHTON, Harvard Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

TO CONSUMPTIVES.—The REV. EDWARD A. WILSON, will send (free of charge), to all who desire it, the prescription with the directions for making and using the simple remedy by which he was cured of a lung affection, and that dread disease Consumption. His only object is, to benefit the afflicted and to hope every sufferer will try this prescription, as it will cost them nothing, and may prove a blessing. Please address
REV. EDWARD A. WILSON,
No. 105 South Second Street, Williamsburg, N.Y.
and wait reply.

ESKIN'S OINTMENT.—A Gentleman who suffered from Nervous Debility, Premature Decay, and all the effects of youthful indiscretion, will, for the sake of suffering humanity, send free to all who need it, the recipe and directions for making the simple remedy by which he was cured. Sufferers wishing to profit by the advertiser's experience, can do so by addressing, in post paid envelopes,
JOHN R. OGDEN,
42 Cedar Street, N. Y.

Information.—Information guaranteed to provide a luxurious growth of hair upon a bald head or hairless face, also a recipe for the removal of Pimples, Blotches, Eruptions, etc., on the skin, leaving the same soft, clear and beautiful, can be obtained without charge by addressing,
THOS. F. CHAPMAN, Chemist,
22 Broadway, New York.

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.
COMMISSIONER'S SALE.
James D. Cummings & Co. Plaintiffs.
Elizabeth Ann Cummings, Defendant.
Having been appointed Commissioner in the suit, at the present term of the Mason Circuit Court, I will offer for sale in the highest and best bidder, ON SATURDAY, the 30th day of MAY, 1868, on the premises, One Hundred and Seven and one-half acres of land, lying on the North River, about two miles from the town of M

FOR FANCY JOB PRINTING
CALL AT THE EAGLE OFFICE